The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. The amended claims have been solely to more particularly point out and distinctly claim what Applicants regard as the invention, and not to overcome prior art or any other substantial reason related to patentability.

I.   INVENTORSHIP CHANGE

The Applicants have determined that they inadvertently and without deceptive intent failed to name Mr. Silvano Gai and Mr. Dinesh G. Dutt as co-inventors in the application. Applicants hereby request the Office to add Mr. Gai and Mr. Dutt as named inventors. The total number of inventors is thus four (4): Mr. Itzhak Parnafes; Mr. Shai Mohaban; Mr. Gai; and Mr. Dutt. A Statement of Inventors executed by Mr. Gai and Mr. Dutt, and a Declaration executed by all four (4) inventors are filed concurrently herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48.

Applicants believe that all the requirements of Rule 48 are satisfied and respectfully request the Examiner to confirm the foregoing change of inventors in the next Office communication.

II.   ANTICIPATION ISSUES—GAI REFERENCE

Claims 1-3 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly anticipated by "RSVP Receiver Proxy" by Gai et al. ("*Gai*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

A rejection for anticipation is proper only where a reference shows each and every element or limitation of a claim arranged as in the claim. Here, the claims include features not found in the cited art. In particular, as amended, all the independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 22 feature the subject matter of former claim 4:

> "wherein the step of determining whether to initiate an RSVP reservation process
>> includes the steps of:

13

50325.0085

> determining one or more network parameter values associated with the anticipated traffic flow;
>
> determining one or more transport parameter values associated with the anticipated traffic flow;
>
> determining next and previous hop parameter values associated with the anticipated traffic flow; and
>
> correlating at least one of the ascertained network parameter, transport parameter, next hop parameter, and previous hop parameter values with information defining a relationship between them and whether a RESV message is desired."

In addressing former claim 4, the Office Action contended that *Gai* suggests determining both the next hop and first hop parameters (Office Action, page 3). However, the Office Action overlooks three additional features—(1) determining network parameter values, (2) determining transport parameter values, and (3) correlating at least one of the ascertained network parameter, transport parameter, next hop parameter, and previous hop parameter values with information defining a relationship between them and whether a RESV message is desired. These features are glossed over and not addressed in the Office Action, but represent a fundamental departure from *Gai*. As described in the specification at pp. 19-21, the parameter values may include bandwidth, packet size, packet rate, and average rate, and an example embodiment can determine whether an RESV message is required at all by considering the parameter values and relationship information. An example of a relationship of parameter values based on bandwidth is, "If FLOWSPEC=3, then generate an RESV message."

Gai has no disclosure about performing such decisions based on such parameter values. In the discussion of prior Claim 4 the Office Action makes no attempt to show the foregoing claim features in any cited reference.

50325.0085

Because all the independent Claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 each include at least one feature not found in *Gai*, the *Gai* reference does not support an anticipation rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §102(a). Claims 2-3 depend from Claim 1 and include the same subject matter, and therefore Claims 2-3 are allowable for the same reasons.[1]

III.   NON-OBVIOUSNESS ISSUES—GAI IN VIEW OF BAUGHER IN VIEW OF LIN

Claims 4-7, 9-17, 19-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable by *Gai* in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,101,549 by Baugher et al. (*"Baugher"*). Claims 8 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable by *Gai* in view of *Baugher* in view of "Speech communication for working group based on LAN" by Lin et al. (*"Lin"*). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

A combination of references based on *Gai* fails to teach the all the subject matter asserted in the Office Action or the entire subject matter that is claimed in the rejected claims. In particular, each of the rejected claims is either an independent claim that literally recites, or depends directly or indirectly from an independent claim that literally recites, the feature of **"wherein the step of determining whether to initiate an RSVP reservation process includes the steps of: determining one or more network parameter values associated with the anticipated traffic flow; determining one or more transport parameter values associated with the anticipated traffic flow; determining next and previous hop parameter values associated with the anticipated traffic flow; and correlating at least one of the ascertained network parameter, transport parameter, next hop parameter, and previous hop**

---

[1] For completeness, Applicants note the following technical error in the rationale of the Office Action. The Office Action states that "The proxy server PS1 determines whether to make the

15

50325.0085

parameter values with information defining a relationship between them and whether a RESV message is desired." As described in section I above, *Gai* has no teaching of the foregoing feature. Moreover, *Baugher* and *Lin* do not disclose, teach or suggest the foregoing feature either. As a result, any combination of *Gai*, *Baugher*, or *Lin* necessarily cannot teach the **complete claimed combination.**

Baugher alludes to Path message forwarding in the Abstract, but does not suggest that the forwarded message could define different traffic characteristics. Indeed, *Baugher* teaches away from the above-noted feature by stating that Path message forward occurs merely by receiving the Path message, stripping off a proxy header, and forwarding the identical message into the network. Such a forwarding scheme cannot result in changing traffic characteristics for nodes between the proxy node and the receiver that is desirable for reasons specified in Applicants' specification.

Claims 4, 14, 25, and 34 each feature the step of, or structure for performing the step of, **"concurrently with the generating and communicating steps, forwarding a second RSVP Path message to one or more devices that are along the anticipated path and that are between the proxy node and the anticipated receiver, wherein the second RSVP Path message defines a different set of traffic characteristics for the flow initiated by the sender than the first RSVP message."** Thus, in Claims 4, 14, 25, and 34, in response to receiving an RSVP Path message, the RSVP proxy node returns an RESV message to the sending node on behalf of a receiver that does not support RSVP, **and also concurrently forwards** the Path message to all other nodes in a path between the proxy node and the receiver, **and the Path**

---

reservation." Applicants note that in *Gai*, "PSx" denotes a policy server rather than a proxy server.

50325.0085

message defines different traffic characteristics for the flow. See, e.g., FIG. 4 of the specification and the associated text at pp. 18-19 of the specification.

Gai fails to teach, disclose or suggest such a concurrent forwarding step, and the other references fail to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Claims 4, 14, 25, and 34 are allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §103.

IV. CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for a one-month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, and a further petition is hereby made for any additional period necessary to make this reply timely filed. Please charge any fee shortages or credit any overages Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Christopher J. Palermo
Reg. No. 42,056

1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125
(408) 414-1080, ext. 202
Date: March 8, 2004
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

17

50325.0085